

#### **REMARKS**

Applicants are in receipt of an Office Action from the United States Patent and Trademark Office with regard to the matter captioned above. In the Office Action, the examiner objected to the claims because of an informality wherein, as the examiner pointed out, there were two claims each labeled Claims 9, 10 and 11. The second set of Claims 9-11 were substantially similar to the first set and seemed to the examiner to be introduced in error. Appropriate correction was required.

The examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). It was the examiner's position that Claim 1 was fully anticipated by the teachings of United States Patent No. 6,117,211 (Chan et al.). Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The examiner took the position that those four claims were unpatentable, given the teachings of the Chan et al. patent, in view of the teachings of United States Patent No. 6,220,052 (Tate, Jr. et al.).

Claims 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also. In making that rejection, the examiner took the position that, given the teachings of United States Patent No. 5,506,486 (Hayashi et al.), those two claims would be obvious in view of the teachings of United States Patent No. 4,964,788 (Itami-Kinter et al.).

Claims 5-9 and 11 are merely objected to. The examiner has acknowledged that these six claims were dependent upon a rejected base claim. The examiner conceded, however, that they would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the action taken by the examiner, Applicants hereby amend their application. First, a number of punctuation amendments have been entered. It is submitted that these amendments make the application more readable and understandable.

Applicants do hereby formally cancel the second set of Claims 9-11. By doing so the examiner's objection with regard to the dual presentation of Claims 9-11 has been obviated.

The limitations of Claim 5 have been integrated into Claim 1. Claim 5 is now canceled, and the dependencies of Claims 6 and 8-9 have been changed to make them directly dependent upon Claim 1.

Similar action has been taken with regard to Claims 10-12. Claim 10 has been amended by incorporating therein the limitations of Claim 11. Claim 11 was then canceled.

Claims 1 and 10, the independent claims in the application, are, in view of the examiner's concession, allowable. All other claims retained in the application are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon either Claim 1 or Claim 10. They do, therefore, incorporate therein the limitations of the independent claim upon which they depend and are patentable on the same basis as is the independent claim upon which they depend. All claims in the application are, therefore, allowable.

It is sincerely believed that Claims 1-4, Claims 6-10 and 12

are in condition for allowance. Allowance of the application and passing of the file for printing of formal allowance documents are, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 14-0620.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony CHAN et al.

By their attorney

Date September 21, 2010

/Lawrence M. Nawrocki/  
Lawrence M. Nawrocki  
Reg. No. 29,333  
NAWROCKI, ROONEY & SIVERTSON, P.A.  
Suite 401, Broadway Place East  
3433 Broadway St. N.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55413  
**Customer No. 05909**  
(612) 331-1464